

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PERSONAL INTERVIEW**

As a preliminary matter, Applicants' representative thanks Examiners Le and Johnson for the courtesies extended in the personal interview conducted on March 8, 2010, in which rejections to claims 1, 3, 13, 14, 20, 25, 33, 40, and 41 were discussed.

The Applicants' representative pointed out that, amongst other things, that the Examiner improperly picked and chose various unrelated embodiments of Chandra to allege that Chandra anticipates independent claims 1, 13, 20, 25, and 33, when the standard for applying a §102(b) rejection forbids picking, choosing, and combining various disclosures not directly related to each other. The Applicants also emphasized the arguments made in the Amendment of August 31, 2010, which the Examiner failed to address. The Applicants further pointed out that Chandra fails to teach or suggest all of claims 3 and 14's features "*wherein said determining the business object definition for said business object comprises reverse engineering said business object to examine how the business object was obtained.*" Also, the Examiner misnumbered claims 34-39 as claims 35-40, and failed to address the instant claim 40. Further, since Chandra fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, Chandra also fails to teach or suggest the sequences of the method steps recited by claim 41.

Based on the Applicants' arguments, the Examiners agreed to withdraw the finality of the rejections and reopen prosecution to address the misnumbering of claims 34-39 and address claim 40. The Examiners also agreed to reconsider the rejections based on Chandra in view of the points raised by the Applicants, and to update her search.